UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark. Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov ·

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/671,547	09/27/2000	Seshadri Sathyanarayan	042390.P9328	8296

7590   03/26/2004

Kurt P Leyendecker
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
7th Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, MERILYN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2171	

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 January 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *26-72* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *26-72* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *27 September 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)
since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet.
37 CFR 1.78.
    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☒ Other: *Detailed Action.*

DETAILED ACTION

1.   In response to the communication dated 01/08/2004, claims 26-72 are active in this

application.

Applicant's arguments filed 01/08/2004 with respect to the rejections of claims 26-72 have been

considered. The applicant's arguments on 26-55 are found persuasive. Claims 56-72 stand

rejected. Therefore the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon reconsideration, a new

ground of rejection is made. The office regrets any inconvenienced this latent rejection may

have caused.

Specification

2.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

    o   At page 3, "summary of the invention" is missing.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 56-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kravets (US

6,363,377), as set forth in the previous office action mailed 06/18/2003 (paper #10), and

reiterated herein below for convenience.

Regarding claims 56 and 63, Kravets discloses a method and a machine-readable medium

having stored thereon data representing instructions which, when executed by a machine, cause

the machine to perform operations comprising:

❖ transmitting a search query to a site over a network (See col. 4, lines 23-30);

❖ receiving a search result document from the site, the search result document

comprising a plurality of search result entries (28, Fig. 1A, and col. 4, lines 17-22,

Kravets et al.);

❖ accessing pages associated with at least some of the search result entries (See col.

6, line 46 to col. 7, line 14);

❖ filtering the search result entries (See col. 7, lines 66- 67) by comparing

information from the accessed pages to the query (See col. 7, lines 38-43); and

❖ selecting a subset of the search result entries based on the comparison (See col. 8,

lines 9-16).

Regarding claim 67, Kravets discloses an apparatus comprising:

❖ a query engine (See Fig. 3) to transmit a search query to a site over a network

(See col. 4, lines 23-30); and

❖ a results filter (See Fig. 2B) to receive a search result document from the site, the

search result document comprising a plurality of search result entries, the results

filter further to access pages associated with at least some of the search result

entries, to filter the search result entries by comparing information from the

accessed pages to the query, and to select a subset of the search result entries

based on the comparison as addressed above in claim 56.

Regarding claim 70, Kravets discloses a computer system comprising:

- ❖ a processor (See Fig. 2B, and corresponding text);

- ❖ a network connection (See Fig. 1B);

- ❖ a query engine to transmit using the network connection search queries to search

  engines at Internet sites as addressed above in claim 67; and

- ❖ a results filter to receive search result documents over the network connection

  from the search engines, the search result documents comprising a plurality of

  search result entries, the results filter further to access pages associated with at

  least some of the search result entries, to filter the search result entries by

  comparing information from the accessed pages to the query, and to select a

  subset of the search result entries based on the comparison as addressed above in

  claim 67.

Regarding claims 57, 64, 68, and 71, Kravets discloses at least some of the information

from the accessed pages comprises hypertext links to further pages associated with the respective

search result entry (See col. 8, lines 9-16), the method further comprising parsing hypertext links

into constituent elements (See col. 5, lines 55-64), and comparing the hypertext link constituent

elements to elements of the search query (See col. 6, lines 46-63).

Regarding claims 58 and 65, Kravets discloses selecting a subset of the search result

entries comprises selecting using the comparison of information from accessed pages and the

comparison of hypertext link constituent elements (See col. 7, line 44 to col. 8, line 29).

Regarding claims 59, 66, 69, and 72, Kravets discloses at least some of the search result

entries include a description of an associated document (See col. 8, lines 18-21), the method

further comprising parsing at least a portion of the descriptions into constituent elements (See

col. 5, lines 55-64)[1], and comparing the description constituent elements to elements of the

search query (See col. 8, lines 21-25) and wherein selecting a subset comprises selecting a subset

using the description constituent elements comparison (See col. 8, lines 27-29).

Regarding claim 60, Kravets discloses generating a summary document comprised of the

selected subset of the search result entries, and displaying the summary document (See col. 8,

lines 27-29).

Regarding claim 61, Kravets discloses the network comprises the Internet (See col. 4,

line 32), and the site comprises a search engine at a remote World Wide Web site (See col. 4,

line 32).

Regarding claim 62, Kravets discloses the network comprises the Internet (See col. 4, line 32), the method further comprising transmitting the search query to a plurality of search engines at remote World Wide Web sites (See col. 4, lines 23-30) and receiving a plurality of search result documents from the search engines, each search result document comprising a plurality of search result entries (28, Fig. 1A, and col. 4, lines 17-22, Kravets et al.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 26-28, 30-35, 37-38, 40-45, 47, 49, 51-52, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haitsuka (US 6,505,201), in view of Davis (US 6,269,361).

Regarding claims 26 and 37, Haitsuka discloses a method and a machine-readable medium having stored thereon data representing instructions which, when executed by a machine, cause the machine to perform operations comprising:

❖   monitoring computer usage of a computer user during a usage session (See Fig. 3, and col. 3, lines 14-15, and col. 6, lines 21-25);

---

[1] Please note that hypertext link itself broadly describe the associated document, therefore parsing the hypertext

- ❖ recording information (See col. 6, lines 21-23) including hypertext links selected by the user during the monitored session (See col. 8, lines 22-36);

- ❖ analyzing the recorded hypertext links to determine a user interest for the session (See col. 9, lines 38-47, and col. 6, lines 56-63);

However, Haitsuka is silent as to generating a search engine query based on the determined interest. On the other hand, Davis teaches a search engine query based on the determined interest (See Col. 5, lines 18-34, and col. 8, line 60 to col. 9, line 7, and col. 9, lines 42-66, and col. 12, line 56 to col. 13, line 2, Davis et al.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the method of generating a search engine query based on the determined interest of Davis into the system of Haitsuka so that the feedback information of Haitsuka (Col. 6, line 56 to col. 7, line17, Haitsuka et al.) could further being used for searching advertises as suggested by Davis. The motivation would have been to enable user to search for relevant and targeted advertises based on feedbacks.

Regarding claims 27 and 38, Haitsuka/Davis discloses analyzing comprises parsing hypertext links selected by the user into words (535, Fig. 5, and col. 9, lines 38-42) and determining the user intent based on the parsed words (46-47).

Regarding claim 28, Haitsuka/Davis discloses determining the user interest based on the content of the hypertext links using heuristics (See col. 6, line 28 to col. 7, line 18).

---

links also the same as parsing descriptions.

Regarding claims 30 and 40, Haitsuka/Davis discloses displaying a set of words indicative of the determined user interest (See col. 7, lines 41-54) and a button for the user to click on to indicate a desire to receive information regarding the displayed set of words (See col. 7, lines 47-50).

Regarding claim 31, Haitsuka/Davis discloses displaying an icon for the user to click on to start the usage session (See col. 5, lines 53-56).

Regarding claim 32, Haitsuka/Davis discloses determining a change in the user interest by comparing recorded information to stored category profiles (See col. 6, lines 56-63).

Regarding claim 33, Haitsuka/Davis discloses monitoring further comprises at least one of:

- ❖ monitoring time spent at a network site;

- ❖ monitoring network pages bookmarked by the user (See col. 8, lines 22-30);

- ❖ monitoring frequency that particular network pages are visited (See col. 6, lines 28-37); and

- ❖ monitoring the content of visited network pages (See col. 8, lines 22-30), and

- ❖ wherein analyzing comprises analyzing the recorded information and the hypertext links to determine a user interest for the session (See col. 9, lines 38-47, and col. 6, lines 56-63).

Regarding claims 34 and 41, Haitsuka/Davis discloses generating the query is in response to a user action and is based on the content of an item or a document currently being displayed (See col. 9, lines 42-66, and col. 12, line 56 to col. 13, line 2, Davis et al.).

Regarding claims 35 and 42, Haitsuka/Davis discloses generating a search engine query comprises constructing queries to perform searches using search engines on a plurality of web sites based on the user's interest and transmitting the queries to the plurality of web sites (See col. 9, lines 42-66, and col. 12, line 56 to col. 13, line 2, Davis et al.).

Regarding claim 43, Haitsuka/Davis discloses a profile agent for a computer system comprising:

❖ an activity monitor (110, Fig. 3) to monitor computer usage of a computer user during a usage session (See Fig. 3, and col. 3, lines 14-15, and col. 6, lines 21-25), to record information (See col. 6, lines 21-23) including hypertext links selected by the user during the monitored session (See col. 8, lines 22-36), and to analyze the recorded hypertext links to determine a user interest for the session (See col. 9, lines 38-47, and col. 6, lines 56-63); and

❖ a query engine to generate a search engine query based on the determined interest as addressed above in claims 26 and 37.

Regarding claim 51, Haitsuka/Davis discloses a computer system comprising:

❖ a processor (130, Fig. 3);

❖ a network connection (120, Fig. 3);

❖ an activity monitor (110, Fig. 3) to monitor computer usage of a computer user

during a usage session (See Fig. 3, and col. 3, lines 14-15, and col. 6, lines 21-

25), to record information (See col. 6, lines 21-23) including hypertext links

selected by the user during the monitored session (See col. 8, lines 22-36), and to

analyze the recorded hypertext links to determine a user interest for the session

(See col. 9, lines 38-47, and col. 6, lines 56-63); and

❖ a query engine to generate search engine queries to perform searches using search

engines on a plurality of Internet web sites based on the user's interest and to

transmit the queries to the plurality of web sites as addressed above in claim 26

and 37.

Regarding claims 44 and 52, Haitsuka/Davis discloses the activity monitor parses

hypertext links selected by the user into words (535, Fig. 5, and col. 9, lines 38-42) and

determines the user interest based on the parsed words (46-47).

Regarding claim 45, Haitsuka/Davis discloses the activity monitor determines the user's

interest based on the content of the hypertext links using heuristics (See col. 6, line 28 to col. 7,

line 18).

Regarding claim 47, Haitsuka/Davis discloses the activity monitor comprises stored

category profiles and determines a shift in the user interest by comparing recorded information to

stored category profiles (See col. 6, lines 56-63).

Regarding claim 49, Haitsuka/Davis discloses the query engine constructs queries to

perform searches using search engines on a plurality of web sites based on the user's interest and

transmits the queries to the plurality of web sites (See col. 9, lines 42-66, and col. 12, line 56 to

col. 13, line 2, Davis et al.).

Regarding claim 54, Haitsuka/Davis discloses the activity monitor records at least one of

time spent at a network site, network pages bookmarked by the user (See col. 8, lines 22-30),

frequency that particular network pages are visited (See col. 6, lines 28-37), and the content of

visited network pages (See col. 8, lines 22-30), and the activity monitor analyzes the recorded

information and the hypertext links to determine a user interest for the session (See col. 9, lines

38-47, and col. 6, lines 56-63).

5.   Claims 29, 39, 46, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Haitsuka (US 6,505,201), in view of Davis (US 6,269,361), and further in view of Ryan (US

6,421,675).

Regarding claims 29, 39, 46, and 53, Haitsuka/Davis discloses all the claimed

subject matter as set forth above in claim 26; however, Haitsuka/Davis is silent as to analyzing

comprises applying the hypertext links to keyword tables, the keyword tables comprising words

that are indicative of user interest. On the other hand, Ryan discloses analyzing comprises

applying the hypertext links to keyword tables (See col. 12, lines 16-60, Ryan et al.). Because

the combination of Haitsuka/Davis system uses information on hypertext links to determine user

interest, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to applying the hypertext links to keywords tables as suggested by Ryan,

since applying the hypertext links to keywords tables clarifies user interest by showing links

between information supplies and information request (See col. 12, lines 20-22, Ryan et al.).

6.   Claims 36, 48, 50, and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Haitsuka (US 6,505,201), in view of Davis (US 6,269,361), and further in view of Kravets

(US 6,363,377).

        Regarding claims 36, 48, 50, and 55, Haitsuka/Davis discloses all the claimed subject

matter as set forth above in claim 35, however, Haitsuka/Davis is silent as to receiving search

result documents from the web sites, the search result documents comprising a plurality of search

result entries, filtering the search result entries based on the determined interest, and selecting a

subset of the search result entries based on the filtering. On the other hand, Kravets discloses

receiving search result documents from the web sites, the search result documents comprising a

plurality of search result entries (28, Fig. 1A, and col. 4, lines 17-22, Kravets et al.), filtering the

search result entries based on the determined intent (See col. 8, lines 9-16, Kravets et al.), and

selecting a subset of the search result entries based on the filtering (See col. 8, lines 15-16,

Kravets et al.). Because the combination of Haitsuka/Davis system generate a search engine

query, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to receiving, filtering, and selecting a subset of the search results as suggested by

Kravet, in term of relevant search results.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed on 01/08/20004 about the claim rejection of the last Office

Action have been fully considered. However, upon consideration, a new ground of rejection is

made. Claims 56-72 stand rejected.

Applicant argues that Kravets fails to suggest any kind of filtering the search result

entries based on information in accessed pages. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Col. 7,

line 61 to col. 8, line 16 clearly read on this recitation.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Merilyn P Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5177.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular

communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Mn

MN
March 21, 2004

SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100